

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/441,388	11/16/1999	MATTHEW ACKLEY	F0002-004001 4261	
75	90 01/02/2004		EXAMINER	
KRISTOFER		DETWILER, BRIAN J		
187 PELHAM I WAYLAND, N	ISLAND ROAD MA 01778		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
, .	,		2173	is in the second
		DATE MAILED: 01/02/2004		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action	09/441,388	ACKLEY ET AL.	
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Brian J Detwiler	2173	·
Th MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover she t with the c	correspondenc add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 12 December 2003 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appear Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this appliced in the substitution of this application of the substitution of the subst	cation. A proper re ch places the appli	ply to a cation in
	PLY [check either a) or b)]		
 a) The period for reply expires 6 months from the mailing date of b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adv event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). 	isory Action, or (2) the date set forth in th an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date o FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THI	f the final rejection. E FINAL REJECTION.	See MPEP
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The dathave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extens 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three moleaned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	sion and the corresponding amount of the statutory period for reply originally set in	e fee. The appropriate ex the final Office action; or	tension fee under (2) as set forth in
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF	•		
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:		
(a) they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search ((see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	pelow);		
(c) they are not deemed to place the application i issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mat	erially reducing or	simplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without cancel NOTE:	ing a corresponding number of	finally rejected clai	ms.
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejections.	tion(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a s	eparate, timely file	d amendment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request fo application in condition for allowance because: See		sidered but does No	OT place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaused by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which we	ere newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we			and an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected:			•
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:	•	•	
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) app	roved or b) disapproved by	the Examiner.	
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s).	///	
10. Other:			
<u> </u>		III -	
	CLIDEDVI	JOHN CABECA	INEP

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 11-03) Continuation Sheet (PTOL-303) 09/441,388



Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments are not persuasive. The Finality of the previous Office Action was proper and necessitated by the amendment filed 15 October 2002. Furthermore, the examiner's rejection of the pending claims is fully supported and explained in the Final Rejection mailed 23 June 2003.